

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on Aug. 18, 2006, in which Claims 1-20 were rejected. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, are believed to render the claims at issue patentable.

Claims 1 and 12 are amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added and that the originally filed specification, drawings, and claims support the amendments.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0188049 to Dickens in view of US Pat. No. 6,609,034 to Behrens et al. Claims 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dickens in view of Behrens in further view of US Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0088468 to Hasegawa.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With particular reference to US Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0188049, Dickens discloses a device for interfacing an input device and a

computer includes a microprocessor in communication with a memory. Dickens also discloses the first and second computers are connected by respective cables and connectors to the keyboard 130, 130', mouse 132, 132' and video 134,134'. Respective speaker and microphone cables are connected by audio jack plugs to audio jacks 136, 136' and 138, 138'.

Dickens fails to teach or suggest integrating so many cables into only one cable. Dickens particularly fails to teach or suggest integrating a USB connector and a combination connector into a KVM switch cable.

With particular reference to US Pat. No. 6,609,034, Behrens discloses a KVM switch cable where multiple types of cables are aggregated into one single cable. However, Behrens also fails to teach or suggest integrating a USB connector and a combination connector into a KVM switch cable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references of record and respectfully requests the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejection to be reconsidered and withdrawn. In addition, insofar as claims 2-11 depend from independent claim 1 and add further limitations thereto, claims 2-11 are also allowable over Dickens in view of Behrens.

In addition, amended Claim 12 is also allowable over Dickens in view of Behrens, and even further in view of Hasegawa. Hasegawa discloses a connector that converts signals from USB to PS/2. However, Hasegawa fails to teach or suggest integrating cables into only one cable, fails to teach or suggest integrating a USB connector and a combination connector into a KVM switch cable, and particularly fails to teach or suggest integrating a signal converting device, a USB connector and a combination connector into a KVM switch cable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 12 is allowable over the cited references of record and respectfully requests the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejection to be reconsidered and withdrawn. In addition, insofar as claims 13-20 depend from independent claim 12 and add further limitations thereto, claims 13-20 are also allowable over Dickens in view of Behrens in further view of Hasegawa.

Since the cited reference fail to teach or suggest integrating a signal converting device, a USB connector and a combination connector into a KVM switch cable, claims 1-20 should be allowable over the cited references of record. In addition, the claim amendments are only for clarifying the meaning thereof and not for further limiting the claim scope.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims as currently presented are in condition for allowance and hereby respectfully request reconsideration. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the art cited but not relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant has concluded that these references do not affect the patentability of the claims as currently presented.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111 BJH/cjf
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 17, 2006